



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/304,035	05/03/1999	GIORGIO J. VANZINI	MSI-254US	9156

22801 7590 01/24/2002

LEE & HAYES PLLC  
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500  
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

KIM, AHSHIK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2876

DATE MAILED: 01/24/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/304,035

Applicant(s)

VANZINI ET AL.

Examiner

Ahshik Kim

Art Unit

2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/23/01 (Amendment).
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 22-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 22-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Amendment*

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the amendment filed 19 November 2001.

5

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- 10 (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1 – 5, 22 - 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dedrick  
15 (US 5,701,884).

Dedrick teaches a computer network system 10 including PCMCIA based smart card 11 with flash memory (col. 2, lines 5 – 10; col. 4, lines 1+). Data on the smart card is to be accessed with a passcode or PIN (col. 6, lines 59 – 66), and data collected from the smart card and user interaction is used to configure system elements to accommodate users (col. 6, lines 36 – 45; col.  
20 7, lines 39 – 48). Once smart card is removed from the interface, user related data is deleted from the RAM (col. 6, lines 22 – 33; col. 7, lines 5 – 8).

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all  
25 obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2876

5 (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10 This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

15 3. Claims 6, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (US 5,701,884) in view of Barlow et al (US 6,038,551). The teachings of Dedrick have been discussed above.

20 Although Dedrick teaches encryption in generic terms, Dedrick fails to specifically teach or fairly suggest of encryption where private key resides on smart card and public key is on the host.

Barlow teaches encryption scheme where smart card 14 holds private key and the host 12 has public key (col. 2, line 67 – col. 3, line 3; col. 4, line 60 – col. 5, line 11).

25 In view of Barlow's teaching, it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ notoriously well-known encryption scheme where private key resides on a smart card and public key is available on the host (i.e., PC or the network) to the teachings of Dedrick in order to provide secure communication between the host

Art Unit: 2876

and a smart card, and protect important/sensitive data from being stolen, and thus an obvious expedient.

### ***Response to Arguments***

5     4.     With respect to Applicant's arguments that "Dedrick does not show an assembly both  
....." (page 6, lines 14+), Dedrick clearly teaches a PCMCIA pluggable (form factor of a  
PCMCIA card) card and inherent card reader (col. 4, lines 1+). Pluggable card is a "removable  
storage card". Furthermore above rejection clearly indicates that each client system 12 can be a  
PC connected to LAN environment (col. 3, lines 7+).

10            Regarding arguments against 103 rejection (page 10), the primary reference to Dedrick  
and secondary reference to Barlow et al. are directed at system managing user record/profile  
which can be used in configuring user device(s). The examiner suggests that adding  
private/public key encryption to the primary reference is well within ordinary skill in the art to  
improve security aspect of the smart card, and to further protect the contents of the card and  
15     users as well.

Applicant's argument have been fully considered but they are not persuasive, and thus  
rejection is maintained.

### ***Conclusion***

20            **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time  
policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2876

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to *Ahshik Kim* whose telephone number is (703) 305-5203. The examiner can normally be reached between the hours of 6:00AM to 3:00PM Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee, can be reached on (703) 305-3503. The fax phone number for this Group is (703)308-7722, (703)308-7724, or (703)308-7382.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [ahshik.kim@uspto.gov].

*All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.*

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Ahshik Kim  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2876  
January 22, 2002



KARL D. FRECH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER